



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/994,913	11/27/2001	Simon Edwin Crouch	1509-249	7390

7590 10/15/2004

LOWE HAUPTMAN GILMAN & BERNER, LLP (22429)
Suite 310
1700 Diagonal Road
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

VO, HUYEN X

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2655

DATE MAILED: 10/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/994,913

Applicant(s)

CROUCH ET AL.

Examiner

Huyen Vo

Art Unit

2655

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/14/02, 2/6/02.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless – (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Allinger (DE Patent No. 19747745).

3. Regarding claim 27, Allinger discloses a method of presenting content received from a content server to a user, wherein at least one attribute of the presentation, other than the content itself and language in which it is presented, where applicable, is set in dependence on the user's current locality (*pages 5-6, information associated with each particular location is presented to the user of that location*).

4. Claims 1-3, 5, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Carpenter (European Patent No. 0801342).

5. Regarding claim 1, Carpenter discloses a content presentation method comprising the steps of:

(a) retrieving content to be presented (*col. 5, ln. 32 to col. 6, ln. 57*);

(b) determining a presentation-controlling locality (*col. 5, ln. 32 to col. 6, ln. 57, determining the location of the device*);

(c) presenting the content to a user with at least one attribute of the presentation, other than or additional to the content presented and language in which it is presented, being set in dependence on said presentation-controlling locality determined in step (b) (*col. 5, ln. 32 to col. 6, ln. 57, icons associated with the determined location are presented to the user of the portable device*).

6. Regarding claim 21, Carpenter discloses a content presentation method comprising the steps of:

(a) retrieving content to be presented along with locality data indicating a locality associated with the content (*col. 5, ln. 32 to col. 6, ln. 67, graphical display and icons based on the user's location*); and

(b) presenting the content to a user with at least one attribute of the presentation, other than or additional to the content presented and language in which it is presented, being set in dependence on said locality indicated by the locality data (*col. 5, ln. 32 to col. 6, ln. 67, information and icons and graphics associated with the location of the user are presented to the user through the GUI or audio interface*).

7. Regarding claims 2-3 and 5, Carpenter further discloses a method according to claim 1, wherein said presentation-controlling locality is the user's current locality (*col. 5, ln. 32 to col. 6, ln. 57, the user of the device*), wherein said presentation-controlling locality is a locality identified in locality data included in, or otherwise associated with, the retrieved content (*col. 5, ln. 32 to col. 6, ln. 57, icons displayed*), and wherein the

content is presented at least partially in a visual manner, the said at least one attribute being a visual attribute (*col. 5, ln. 32 to col. 6, ln. 57, displaying icons*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 4, 6, and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carpenter (EP No. 0801342) in view of Allinger (DE Patent No. 19747745).

10. Regarding claims 4 and 6, Carpenter fails to disclose a method of claim 1, wherein the content is provided in the form of content pages served over a network from a content server, and wherein the content is presented at least partially by sound, the said at least one attribute being an audio attribute. However Allinger teaches that the content is provided in the form of content pages served over a network from a content server (*pages 5-6*), and the content is presented at least partially by sound, the said at least one attribute being an audio attribute (*audio played through the headset 4 worn by the user in figure 1*).

Since Carpenter and Allinger are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Carpenter by incorporating the teaching of Allinger in order to provide a central information storage ready for retrieval and audibly played by multiple user devices. The advantage of this central information storage is to enable multiple users to access the same information at the same time.

11. Regarding claims 14-15, Carpenter fails to disclose a method according to claims 4 and 1, wherein the said presentation-controlling locality is sent to the content server which uses this information to set the said at least one attribute before sending the content to the user, and wherein steps (a) to (c) are effected by equipment physically associated with the user. However, Allinger teach that the said presentation-controlling locality is sent to the content server which uses this information to set the said at least one attribute before sending the content to the user (*pages 5-6, the location of the user is sent to the control system 9, and based on this location, the control system searches database 11 for appropriate information and sends this information back to the user*), and wherein steps (a) to (c) are effected by equipment physically associated with the user (*elements 6-7 in figure 1 together determine the location of the user and initiate voice services conducted via elements 5 and 10 in figure 1*).

Since Carpenter and Allinger are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Carpenter by incorporating the teaching of Allinger in order to

provide a central information storage ready for retrieval by multiple user devices. The advantage of this central information storage is to enable multiple users to access the same information at the same time.

12. Claims 7-13, 16-20, 22-26, and 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carpenter (EP No. 0801342) in view of Shigetomi et al. (US Patent No. 6393400).

13. Regarding claims 7-8 and 22, Carpenter fails to disclose a method of claims 1 and 21, wherein the content is presented by voice with the accent of the voice being set to reflect a regional accent appropriate to the said presentation-controlling locality, and wherein the content is provided in the form of a content page intended for use with a style sheet, step (c) involving selecting a style sheet according to said presentation-controlling locality and applying it to said content. However, Shigetomi et al. teach that the content is presented by voice with the accent of the voice being set to reflect a regional accent appropriate to the said presentation-controlling locality (*col. 3, ln. 13-29, speech modification to obtain a particular regional accent*), and wherein the content is provided in the form of a content page intended for use with a style sheet, step (c) involving selecting a style sheet according to said presentation-controlling locality and applying it to said content (*col. 3, ln. 13-29, modify speech to obtain a particular regional accent*).

Since Carpenter and Shigetomi et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Carpenter by incorporating the teaching of Shigetomi et al. in order to make the synthesized speech sound more natural to people living ^{in a} ~~the~~ that specific region.

14. Regarding claims 9-11, Carpenter further disclose a method according to claim 8, wherein said presentation-controlling locality is the user's current locality (*col. 5-6, detecting the location of the device used by the user*), wherein said presentation-controlling locality is a locality identified in locality data included in, or otherwise associated with, the content page (*col. 5-6, the information associated with specific location is presented to the user of the device*), and wherein the style sheet is selected from a set of locality-dependent style sheets, this set being specified by the user (*col. 7, ln. 54-58*).

15. Regarding claims 12-13, Carpenter fails to disclose that wherein the style sheet is selected from a set of locality-dependent style sheets, this set being specified by the content server by a style-sheet-set reference associated with the content, and wherein the style sheet is selected from a set of locality-dependent style sheets, this set being specified by the content server by a style-sheet-set reference associated with the content. However, Shigetomi et al. further disclose that the style sheet is selected from a set of locality-dependent style sheets, this set being specified by the content server by

Art Unit: 2655

a style-sheet-set reference associated with the content (*col. 3, ln. 13-29, speech modification to obtain a particular regional accent*), and wherein the style sheet is selected from a set of locality-dependent style sheets, this set being specified by the content server by a style-sheet-set reference associated with the content (*col. 3, ln. 13-29, speech modification to obtain a particular regional accent*).

Since Carpenter and Shigetomi et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Carpenter by incorporating the teaching of Shigetomi et al. in order to make the synthesized speech sound more natural to people living in a specific region.

16. Regarding claim 16, Carpenter fails to disclose a method according to claim 1, wherein the content is provided in the form of content pages intended for use with a style sheet, the style sheet appropriate to the said presentation-controlling locality being fetched from a remote server by user equipment physically associated with the user. However, Shigetomi et al. teach that the content is provided in the form of content pages intended for use with a style sheet, the style sheet appropriate to the said presentation-controlling locality being fetched from a remote server by user equipment physically associated with the user (*col. 3, ln. 13-29, speech modification to obtain a particular regional accent*).

Since Carpenter and Shigetomi et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of invention to modify Carpenter by incorporating the teaching of Shigetomi et al. in order to make the synthesized speech sound more natural to people living in a specific region.

17. Regarding claims 17, 28 and 32, Carpenter discloses a presentation method and apparatus for content pages, the method comprising the steps of:

- (a) retrieving a content page to be presented (*col. 5, ln. 32 to col. 6, ln. 57*);
- (b) determining a presentation-controlling locality (*col. 5, ln. 32 to col. 6, ln. 57, determining the location of the device*);
- (d) presenting the retrieved content page (*col. 5, ln. 32 to col. 6, ln. 57*).

Carpenter fails to specifically disclose the steps of (c) retrieving a presentation style sheet in dependence on said presentation-controlling locality determined in step (b); and (d) presenting the retrieved content page using the style sheet retrieved in step (c). However, Shigetomi et al. teach the steps of (c) retrieving a presentation style sheet in dependence on said presentation-controlling locality determined in step (b) (*col. 3, ln. 13-29, speech modification to obtain a particular regional accent*); and (d) presenting the retrieved content page using the style sheet retrieved in step (c) (*col. 3, ln. 13-29, speech modification to obtain a particular regional accent*).

Since Carpenter and Shigetomi et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Carpenter by incorporating the teaching of

Shigetomi et al. in order to make the synthesized speech sound more natural to people living in a specific region.

18. Regarding claim 23, Carpenter discloses a presentation method for content pages, the method comprising the steps of:

(a) retrieving a content page to be presented (*col. 5, ln. 32 to col. 6, ln. 57*);

(b) determining a presentation-controlling locality (*col. 5, ln. 32 to col. 6, ln. 57, determining the location of the device*);

Carpenter fails to disclose the steps of: (a) retrieving a content page to be presented along with style-sheet-set data identifying a set of style sheets (); (c) retrieving a presentation style sheet, from said set of style sheets, in dependence on said presentation-controlling locality determined in step (b) (); and (d) presenting the retrieved content page using the style sheet retrieved in step (c) (). However, Shigetomi et al. teach the steps of: (a) retrieving a content page to be presented along with style-sheet-set data identifying a set of style sheets (*col. 3, ln. 13-29, speech modification to obtain a particular regional accent*); (c) retrieving a presentation style sheet, from said set of style sheets, in dependence on said presentation-controlling locality determined in step (b) (*col. 3, ln. 13-29, speech modification to obtain a particular regional accent*); and (d) presenting the retrieved content page using the style sheet retrieved in step (c) (*col. 3, ln. 13-29, speech modification to obtain a particular regional accent*).

Since Carpenter and Shigetomi et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of invention to modify Carpenter by incorporating the teaching of Shigetomi et al. in order to make the synthesized speech sound more natural to people living in a specific region.

19. Regarding claims 18, 24, and 29, Carpenter fails to disclose a method and system according to claims 17, 23, and 28, wherein the content page is presented at least partially by sound, but fails to disclose that the retrieved style sheet being an audio style sheet. However, Shigetomi et al. further teach that the content page is presented at least partially by sound, but fails to disclose that the retrieved style sheet being an audio style sheet (*col. 3, ln. 13-29, speech modification to obtain a particular regional accent*).

Since Carpenter and Shigetomi et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Carpenter by incorporating the teaching of Shigetomi et al. in order to make the synthesized speech sound more natural to people living in a specific region.

20. Regarding claims 19-20 and 25-26, Carpenter further discloses a method according to claims 1 and 23, wherein said presentation-controlling locality is the user's current locality (*col. 5, ln. 32 to col. 6, ln. 57, the user of the device*), and wherein said presentation-controlling locality is a locality identified in locality data included in, or

otherwise associated with, the retrieved content (*col. 5, ln. 32 to col. 6, ln. 57, icons displayed*).

21. Regarding claim 30, Carpenter further discloses an apparatus according to claim 28, wherein said presentation-controlling locality is the user's current locality (*col. 5, ln. 32 to col. 6, ln. 57, the user of the device*), the said means for determining the presentation-controlling locality being an arrangement for determining the location of the apparatus (*col. 5, ln. 32 to col. 6, ln. 57, icons displayed*).

22. Regarding claim 31, Carpenter further discloses an apparatus according to claim 28, wherein said presentation-controlling locality is a locality identified in locality data included in, or otherwise associated with, the content page (*col. 5, ln. 32 to col. 6, ln. 57, icons displayed*), the said means for determining the presentation-controlling locality being means operative to receive the locality data along with the content page (*col. 5, ln. 32 to col. 6, ln. 57, icons displayed*).

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huyen Vo whose telephone number is 703-305-8665. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doris To can be reached on 703-305-4827. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner Huyen X. Vo

September 10, 2004


SUSAN MCFADDEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER